DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 001 UD 021 076

AUTHOR Mahony, Janice; Hayward, Becky Jon
TITLE Evaluation of Instructional Process and Support Components, 1978-79. Evaluation of the ESEA Title I Program of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia.
INSTITUTION NTS Research Corp., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE May 80
CONTRACT 0487-AA-NS-N-9-GA
NOTE 92p.: For related documents see UD 021 072 and UD 021 077-078.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Affective Objectives; *Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Parent Participation; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Student Educational Objectives; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *District of Columbia; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

The goals of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I program operated by the Public Schools of the District of Columbia were to provide disadvantaged children with supplemental instructional services to improve their performance in reading and mathematics and to support their affective and psychomotor development. Almost 15,000 students in grades K-7 received services during the 1978-79 school year. This volume of the four-part evaluation focuses on the instructional process and support components of the program. Data were collected through questionnaires distributed to all school and Title I staff involved in the components. Evaluative findings are presented in this report in terms of the responses of each staff group surveyed (principals, laboratory teachers, classroom teachers, support staff, and pupil personnel workers). In addition, the parental involvement component is discussed through a review of the component's goals. Questionnaires are appended. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OCT 2 1 1980

ED197001

EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Evaluation of Instructional Process and Support Components

1978-79

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M Cooper
D.C. Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted to:
Division of Research and Evaluation
The Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.
Under Contract No. 0487-AA-NS-N-9-GA

Prepared by: **NTS Research Corporation**

ED210176

EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM OF THE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS AND SUPPORT COMPONENTS

1978-79

Submitted to:

Division of Research and Evaluation
The Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Under Contract No. 0487-AA-NS-9-GA

Prepared by:

Janice Mahony
Becky Jon Hayward, Ph.D.
NTS Research Corporation

OCT 2 0 1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their generous contributions of time and energy to the 1978-79 evaluation effort, we wish to express our gratitude to the following persons:

Mrs. Anne W. Pitts
Executive Director of the Title I Program;

Dr. Judine Johnson
Deputy Director of the Title I Program;

Dr. Mildred Cooper
Assistant Superintendent for Research and Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation;

Mrs. June Bland
Assistant for Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation;

Mr. Earl L. Hunter
Director of Title I Evaluation
Division of Research and Evaluation;

Dr. Phyllis Hobson, Coordinator
Title I Parent Involvement Component.

We should also like to thank the Title I principals, program coordinators, teachers, aides, nonteaching professionals, and parents, who assisted with a number of important activities associated with the evaluation. Other persons whose assistance was invaluable included NTS Region III Technical Assistance Center staff, Dr. Joan B. Troy and Dr. Joseph Haenn; as well as evaluation project staff (Daniel Johnston and B. Steven Davis).

Janice Mahony
Becky Jon Hayward, Ph.D.

May 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	
Overview of the Title I Program	I
Program Selection Process	3
Program Objectives and Expected Outcomes	3
Program Services	5
FINDINGS	
Assessment of the Title I Program by Principals of Title I Schools	I0
Program Objectives	I1
Supplementary Instructional Services	I2
Noninstructional Services	I4
Involvement of Parents in School Affairs	I6
Summary	I6
Assessment of the Title I Program by Laboratory Teachers	I8
Laboratory Program	I8
Tutorial Program	20
Instructional Support Activities	2I
Staff Development	23
Overall Program Effectiveness	24
Assessment of the Title I Program by Title I Classroom Teachers	25
Composition of the Title I Classroom	25
Title I Classroom Program	28
Interactions Among Providers of Title I Services	30
Effectiveness of Title I Services	3I
Staff Development Activities	32
Overall Program Effectiveness	32
Summary	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

	Page
Assessment of the Title I Program by Title I Building Support Staff	34
Program Assistants	34
Educational Aides	35
Parent Partners	36
Effectiveness of the Tutorial Program	37
Staff Interactions	38
Staff Development	40
Effectiveness of the School Year	41
Summary	42
Assessment of the Title I Program by Title I Pupil Personnel Workers	43
Program Operations	43
Pupil Personnel Worker	44
Pupil Personnel Aide	46
Clinical Psychologist	48
Psychiatric Social Worker	49
TITLE I PROGRAM'S PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT COMPONENT	
Overview of the Title I Parental Involvement Component	52
Parent Advisory Councils (PACs)	53
Parent Volunteers	54
Summary	55
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	
Principals and Teachers	56
Building Support Staff	57
Pupil Personnel Team	57
Parents	57
APPENDIX	
Instructional Process and Support Instrumentation	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number of Students Receiving Title I Supplementary Instructional Services by Grade (1978-79)	2
2	Principals' Rating of Title I Program Success in Achieving Program Objectives (in Percent) (1978-79)	II
3	Principals' Rating of the Effectiveness of Title I Supplementary Instructional Services in Reading and Mathematics (in Percent) (1978-79)	I2
4	Principals' Rating of the Effectiveness of Title I Support Services (in Percent) (1978-79)	I5
5	Principals' Rating of Frequency of Parental Involvement in School Activities (in Percent) (1978-79)	I6
6	Lab Teachers' Evaluation of Scheduling (in Percent) (1978-79)	I9
7	Lab Teachers' Rating of Adequacy of Lab Components (in Percent) (1978-79)	20
8	Lab Teachers' Rating of Effectiveness of Tutorial Program (in Percent) (1978-79)	2I
9	Description of Kindergarten Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent) (1978-79)	26
10	Description of First Grade Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent) (1978-79)	26
11	Description of Second Grade Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent) (1978-79)	27
12	Description of Third Grade Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent) (1978-79)	27
13	Type of Classroom Utilized by Title I Classroom Teachers (in Percent) (1978-79)	28
14	Classroom Teachers' Rating of Four Title I Instructional and Support Services (in Percent) (1978-79)	3I
15	Building Support Staff's Rating of Effectiveness of Tutorial Program (in Percent) (1978-79)	38

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
16	Building Support Staff's Rating of Helpfulness of Building Title I Staff (in Percent) (1978-79)	39
17	Building Support Staff's Rating of Helpfulness of Regional Title I Staff (in Percent) (1978-79)	40
18	Building Support Staff's Rating of Effectiveness of School Year (in Percent) (1978-79)	42
19	Organization, Meeting Dates and Size of Title I School PACs, Categorized by Region (1978-79)	53
20	School PAC Activity Levels, Categorized by Region (in Percent) (1978-79)	54
21	Parent Volunteers' Level of Participation in Schools	55

INTRODUCTION

An evaluation of the 1978-79 ESEA Title I Program operated in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia was conducted by NTS Research Corporation under contract to the Division of Research and Evaluation, District of Columbia Public Schools. The results of this evaluation are presented in a series of reports.[1] One of these is the current document, Evaluation of the Title I Instructional Process and Support Components. This report examines the implementation of the Title I program at the school level. Subsequent sections of this report include a brief overview of the Title I program and evaluation design, a presentation of the results, and a summary of the findings.

Overview of the Title I Program

The central goal of the ESEA Title I Program operated by the Public Schools of the District of Columbia is to provide disadvantaged children with supplementary instructional services which will enable them to improve their performance in reading and mathematics. Additionally, student affective and psychomotor development is emphasized as an important program goal. For academic year 1978-79, the program had a budget of approximately $14.6 million to provide

[1] Other reports in the series are Evaluation of Program Impact on Reading and Mathematics Achievement, Evaluation of the Impact of Title I Students' Background and Behavior on Educational and Affective Development, and Executive Summary.

supplementary instructional and support services to almost 15,000 Title I eligible students in 89 public and private elementary and junior high schools.[2] Students in grades kindergarten, one, two, three and seven were eligible to receive services. Additionally, a pilot fourth grade reading program was operated in selected schools.

Table 1 indicates the distribution by grade of students who received Title I services during the 1978-79 school year. As these data indicate, a total of almost 15,000 students received supplementary instruction in reading, mathematics, or reading and mathematics during the 1978-79 school year.

Table 1

Number of Students Receiving Title I Supplementary Instructional Services[a] by Grade (1978-79)
(Unduplicated)

Grade	Number of Students Served
K	2,845
1	3,172
2	2,697
3	3,147
4	902
7	2,091
Total	14,854

[a]For kindergarten, the number of students served included kindergarten students served by Title I aides and classroom teachers. For grades one, two, three, and seven, the number served is the total number of students who received laboratory instruction in reading or mathematics during the 1978-79 school year. Fourth graders received reading instruction only.

Source: Service data provided by Title I program office.

[2]A pilot program was planned for high schools but was not implemented in 1978-79. Appendix A includes a listing of Title I schools for 1978-79.

Program Selection Process

Selection of students for participation in the 1978-79 Title I program was based on two factors: residence in an eligible school attendance area and educational deprivation. School area eligibility was determined through use of a formula which weights the number of children from low-income families residing within the assigned school boundary as indicated by 1970 census data (40 percent) and the number of children eligible for free lunches in the year of selection (60 percent). Thus, eligible schools were determined on the basis of relative level of poverty in the area and on numbers of children affected by conditions of poverty.

For students residing in Title I school attendance areas, several factors were used to determine educational deprivation, including:

- scores at or below the fortieth percentile on the reading or mathematics section of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) administered in the previous spring;
- over age for grade; and
- repeat of a grade.[3]

Additionally, students could be recommended for Title I services by their teachers or principals if they had transferred into the school attendance area and for this or some other reason did not have achievement test scores, or if their classroom performance was substantially lower than their test scores predicted. In such cases, documentation was required to support the selection.

Program Objectives and Expected Outcomes

Objectives. As indicated previously, the major goal of the 1978-79 program was to improve the academic, psychomotor, and effective performance and behavior of Title I students. To facilitate achievement of this goal, a number of student-

[3]Students who have repeated or are over age for grade are eligible for Title I services regardless of their achievement test scores.

related objectives were delineated. Objectives in each of the four major areas of program focus (reading achievement, mathematics achievement, psychomotor skills, and affective behavior) included the following:

> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will achieve a mean gain of ten months in reading, as measured by standardized achievement tests.
>
> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will achieve a mean gain of ten months in mathematics, as measured by standardized achievement tests.
>
> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will demonstrate a positive change in affective behaviors, as reported by measures of affective growth.
>
> Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and in grade 7 will demonstrate growth in psychomotor development, as indicated by measures of psychomotor growth.[4]

Expected outcomes. For each of the program objectives focusing on academic performance, a set of expected student outcomes was articulated. For reading, these outcomes included the following:

- an increase in the quantity and quality of student verbal interaction, as measured by informal tests and adult-student observations;
- an increase in student listening comprehension skills, as indicated by measures of listening comprehension;
- an increase in student listening, speaking, reading, and writing vocabularies, as measured by informal and standardized measures and tests;
- an increase in student ability to attack new words, as measured by individual reading inventories;
- an increase in student reading comprehension, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in the quality and quantity of books read by students, as measured by records maintained by teachers and students; and

[4]Source: ESEA Title I Comprehensive Program Description for FY 1979, Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

- an increase in the quantity and quality of student written language expression, as measured by a comparative record maintained by teachers and students.

Expected student outcomes in mathematics included:

- an increase in student understanding of the language of mathematics, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in student understanding and verbalization of the concepts of mathematics, as measured by observation and informal standardized tests;
- an increase in student computational skills, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in student problem-solving abilities, as measured by informal and standardized tests;
- an increase in student ability and opportunity to apply mathematical skills to practical life experiences, as indicated by adult-student observations; and
- an increase in student interest in and appreciation for mathematics, as measured by adult-student observations and attitude scales.

Finally, the program identified a series of affective outcomes which could be expected of students participating in the 1978-79 Title I program. These included:

- a positive self-concept, as indicated by measures of affective growth;
- a positive interest in and attitude toward the school curriculum, as indicated by measures of affective growth;
- positive peer relationships among students, as indicated by measures of affective growth; and
- positive relationships between students and adults, as indicated by measures of affective growth.

Program Services

Two major types of services were provided by the 1978-79 Title I program to facilitate achievement of program objectives and outcomes. The major service offered was supplementary instruction in reading and mathematics. Additionally, a number of support and optional services were available to Title I participants.

A brief description of these services is presented in this section.

Supplementary instructional services. At the elementary level (grades one, two, and three)[5], the Title I supplementary instructional program includes three components, or interventions: the laboratory program, the tutorial program, and the classroom program. For seventh graders, instructional services include the laboratory and tutorial programs.

The laboratory program provides participants with 45 minutes in elementary and 55 minutes in junior high school of reading or mathematics instruction daily in a laboratory setting for a full school year. In elementary schools, laboratories are staffed by a team consisting of a Title I teacher, educational aide, and program assistant. In general, Title I junior high schools have two teachers and two educational aides to provide laboratory instruction. In both elementary and junior high schools, the lab program is the major component of the Title I supplementary instructional services.

The second major component of Title I instructional services at both the elementary and junior high school levels is the tutorial program. This component provides additional reading or mathematics instruction to laboratory participants who have been recommended by their lab teacher and have parental permission to attend. The tutorial program operates either before or after school on Monday through Thursday and is staffed by educational aides.

The third component of Title I instructional services is the classroom program. This component provides special instruction in reading and mathematics to Title I students in kindergarten through grade three. Instruction is provided in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teacher for one and one-half hours per week. Additionally, Title I program assistants, parent-partners, and, in kindergarten, kindergarten aides serve as staff members for

[5]The Title I fourth grade program provided reading laboratory only.

the classroom component.

Support services. In addition to instructional services, a number of supportive services designed to facilitate achievement of program objectives were provided by the 1978-79 Title I program. These services fall into two categories: base and optional services. Base services included the following:

- parent volunteer services;
- program assistant services; and
- clothing, shoes, glasses, and hearing aides.

Optional services provided Title I elementary students included the following:

- pupil personnel team services;
- kindergarten aide services;
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services; and
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services.[6]

Base support services were provided to all Title I elementary schools, while optional services were arranged to comprise four option packages, each including three of the four service options. Each school was provided a package of optional services in addition to the base services available to all Title I children.

A lottery system was utilized to allocate optional Title I services packages to elementary schools during the 1978-79 school year. The four packages included the following services:

Package A

- pupil personnel team services
- kindergarten aide services
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services

[6]Parent partner services and cultural enrichment comprised a single optional service, as did staff development and regional resource teacher services.

Package B

- pupil personnel team services
- kindergarten aide services
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services

Package C

- kindergarten aide services
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services

Package D

- pupil personnel team services
- parent partner and cultural enrichment services
- staff development for classroom teachers and regional resource teacher services

A total of 16 schools each were provided Package A services, Package B services and Package D services, while 17 schools were provided Package C services.

While the full evaluation of the 1978-79 Title I program includes assessment of the students' progress in all areas of program service,[7] the focus of this report is on the Title I instructional process and support components. Evaluation of these components emphasized the assessment of the following four areas:

- Objectives of the Title I program;
- Instructional staff's perceptions of their job;
- Interaction among Title I and school staff; and
- Effectiveness of the Title I program.

In order to conduct the evaluation, questionnaires were distributed to all school and Title I staff members involved in the instructional process or support components of the program. The survey included principals, classroom

[7] Evaluations of other program components, including the Model A report, are presented in separate reports.

teachers, Title I laboratory teachers, building support staff, and members of the pupil personnel team. This report presents the results of the findings for each group. In addition, the Title I parental involvement component is discussed, and the concluding section is a summary of the findings.

FINDINGS

Assessment of the Title I Program by Principals of Title I Schools

The Principal's Information Form (PIF) was designed to obtain evaluative information on all aspects of the Title I program's operation at the school level in the 1978-79 school year. This questionnaire elicited assessments from the principals on each of the following:

- the program's success at the school level in attaining each of four Title I objectives;
- the effectiveness of the Title I basic skills, supplementary instructional services;
- the effectiveness of Title I support services;
- the extent of Title I parents' participation in school activities; and
- the responsiveness of the Title I program to student needs.

In addition, principals were asked to suggest means of improving the three components of the Title I basic skills supplementary instructional services (the laboratory, classroom, and tutorial programs).

The Division of Research and Evaluation distributed questionnaires to principals at 83 Title I schools, and received 62 completed forms, for a 75 percent response rate.[8] Fifty-one respondents were elementary school principals, 10 were junior high principals, and one was not identified.

---

[8]This response rate constitutes a significant improvement over that attained during the 1977-78 evaluation, when only 36 percent of the principals returned the questionnaires.

Program Objectives

The Title I program specified four main objectives for the 1978-79 school year: to improve the performance of Title I students in reading and mathematics, to effect a positive change in affective behavior among program participants, and to encourage student development in psychomotor skills. Services provided to Title I students focused on the attainment of these objectives. As shown in Table 2, principals rated the 1978-79 Title I program operated at their schools as effective to very effective in achieving each of these objectives (88 percent,[9] 88 percent, 78 percent, and 88 percent, respectively). All of these percentages are very high and suggest a high rate of program success at the school level. As the data suggest, however, the program was rated by principals as slightly less successful in improving students' affective behavior than in improving academic performance and psychomotor skills.

Table 2

Principals' Rating of Title I Program Success in Achieving Program Objectives (in Percent) (1978-79)

Objective	Rating: Very effective 1-2	Rating: Effective 3	Rating: Relatively ineffective 4-5
Improved student achievement in reading (n=60)	43.3	45.0	11.7
Improved student achievement in mathematics (n=58)	34.4	53.4	12.1
Effected a positive change in affective behavior (n=60)	38.3	40.0	21.7
Stimulated psychomotor development (n=59)	32.2	55.9	11.9

[9]Throughout this report, all percentages are calculated using the total number of respondents for each question. The number of respondents for each question is indicated in each table.

Supplementary Instructional Services

As suggested previously, the main goal of the 1978-79 Title I program was to improve the performance of participants in reading and mathematics. Supplementary instruction in these basic skills areas is provided through the laboratory, classroom, and tutorial programs. As shown in Table 3, over 80 percent of the responding principals in Title I schools indicated that the laboratory (93.5 percent) and classroom (84.7 percent) programs were effective to highly effective in improving the academic performance of Title I students. Almost two thirds of the principals rated the laboratory program as very effective, and over one-half indicated that the classroom program was very effective.[10] However, many of the principals appeared to be less satisfied with the tutorial program. Although 61 percent reported that the program was effective to very effective, less than one-quarter rated the tutorial component as very effective and 37 percent of the respondents judged the program to be relatively ineffective.

Table 3

Principals' Rating of the Effectiveness of Title I Supplementary Instructional Services in Reading and Mathematics (in Percent) (1978-79)

	Rating			
Objective	Very effective 1-2	Effective 3	Relatively ineffective 4-5	Not implemented
Laboratory (n=62)	62.9	30.6	6.5	---
Classroom (n-59)	52.5	32.2	11.9	3.4
Tutorial (n-62)	22.6	38.7	37.1	1.6

[10] The PIF and all other instruments included a five-point rating scale. While complete data were tabulated (and is available upon request), the data have been aggregated for ease of presentation. Rating points 1 and 2 have been aggregated and defined as "very effective"; similarly, points 4 and 5 have been aggregated and defined as "relatively ineffective". Samples of all questionnaires appear in the Appendix.

While data presented in Table 3 indicate a high degree of satisfaction with instructional services among Title I principals, many of the respondents suggested that some aspects of the laboratory, classroom, and tutorial programs needed improvement in order to enhance the overall quality of instructional services. The most frequent suggestion made by principals was an increase in program personnel, particularly educational aides, and that Title I staff receive additional inservice training and appropriate job advancement. Other recommendations included the following:

- The program should be better organized, especially in regard to scheduling; it should have clear objectives, and be closely monitored by the regional LEA office;
- Laboratory and classroom instruction should be coordinated;
- The program needs more equipment and instructional materials, and the supplies should be delivered on time;
- There should be smaller classes so that the students may receive more individualized instruction; and
- Efforts should be made to improve students' attendance.

Specific changes recommended for the classroom program included:

- The classroom needs more aides and paraprofessionals;
- More materials, classroom and storage space should be provided; and
- More interaction and communication among Title I classroom teachers, resource teachers, and administrators should occur.

In respect to the tutorial program, principals emphasized that educational aides should receive more inservice training and that each aide should be paired with a teacher. Further suggestions concerning tutorial services included:

- The time alloted for tutorial should be rescheduled and extended;
- The organization and supervision of the program should be improved, and each Title I staff member should have his/her duties clarified;
- Incentives should be developed to encourage student and aide participation and to foster parent interest and support; and
- The program needs more equipment and instructional materials (including games, special materials, etc.)

In general, principals of Title I schools clearly indicated that the laboratory program had been the most successful component of Title I supplementary instructional services. The laboratory program's success seems to be due to its carefully controlled structure. Even though scheduling is sometimes a problem, Title I students are able to meet on a regular basis with both professionals and educational aides; they receive substantially more individualized basic skills instruction than they would be likely to experience in the classroom.

In regard to the tutorial program, on the other hand, comments received from the principals suggest that requiring aides and Title I students to spend additional time at school in the afternoon is not an effective method of delivering educational services. Principals indicated that aides lacked both interest and experience to participate effectively in the program. It appears that more professional guidance for the aides, in terms of inservice training and supervision, is a prerequisite for developing a more effective tutorial program. After increased inservice training, educational aides will be more adequately prepared to stimulate the interest of their students, a necessity if the program continues to be operated outside normal school hours. Furthermore, the commitment of the aides to the tutorial program might be encouraged by an upgrading of their job status and salary.

Noninstructional Services

In addition to supplementary instruction in reading and mathematics, the Title I program provides a number of other services to program participants. These include parent partner services, clothing and shoes, eyeglasses, hearing aids, cultural enrichment activities, and Pupil Personnel Services (the latter two not available in all schools). Table 4 presents principals' ratings of the effectiveness of Title I support services at their schools. As indicated, most principals rated cultural enrichment activities (83 percent), parent partners

(91.2 percent), and clothing and shoes (81.9 percent) services as among the most effective program support services, and over half of the principals indicated that these services were very effective. Somewhat fewer respondents (58 percent) viewed Pupil Personnel Services as effective to very effective. It should be noted, however, that Pupil Personnel Services were not implemented at 19 percent of the responding schools. Similarly, although a majority of the respondents indicated that provision of eyeglasses was effective, eyeglasses were not available through the Title I program in 22 percent of the responding principals' schools. Availability of hearing aids was too limited to generalize on their effectiveness.

Table 4

Principals' Rating of the Effectiveness of Title I Support Services (in Percent) (1978-79)

Objective	Rating			
	Very effective 1-2	Effective 3	Relatively ineffective 4-5	Not implemented[a]
Cultural enrichment (n=59)	55.9	27.1	5.1	18.6
Parent partners (n=57)	59.6	31.6	7.0	1.8
Clothing and shoes (n=61)	50.8	31.1	13.1	4.9
Pupil personnel services (n=59)	25.4	32.2	23.7	18.6
Eyeglasses (n=58)	29.3	27.6	20.7	22.4
Hearing aids (n=56)	7.1	16.1	17.9	58.9

[a]Because of optional package design, certain services were not available in certain schools and thus were counted in the "not implemented" category.

Involvement of Parents in School Affairs

While the Title I program is targeted specifically at educationally deprived students, attempts are also made to involve the parents of Title I students in their children's educational progress. In general, the 1978-79 Title I program aimed and proved successful at encouraging parents to take an interest in school affairs. As shown in Table 5, 78 percent of the principals reported that parents participated frequently to very frequently in school activities, with 45 percent indicating very frequent parental participation. Only 22 percent of the principals indicated that parents of Title I students rarely became involved in school activities.

Table 5

Principals' Rating of Frequency of Parental Involvement in School Activities (in Percent) (1978-79)

	Rating		
Objective	Very frequently 1-2	Frequently 3	Rarely involved 4-5
Principals	45.0	33.3	21.7

Summary

In assessing the overall Title I program in 1978-79, an overwhelming majority of the principals (95 percent; n=61) indicated that the program was responsive to the needs of their school's students. Principals cited various reasons as evidence of program responsiveness. The most frequent was that special program personnel were responsive to student needs and helped reinforce basic skills. Other indications cited for program responsiveness included the following:

- Reading and math skills improved; and
- Students benefited from small group instruction.

In conclusion, principals rated most of the individual Title I components very highly, especially the laboratory program. Approximately one-third of the principals recommended improvements in the laboratory, classroom, and tutorial programs including the following: additional program personnel and staff development activities; more instructional materials; and better coordination and communication among program staff. Principals also praised the cultural enrichment activities, parent partners, and clothing and shoes services. In schools where Pupil Personnel Services were implemented, almost one-fourth of principals responding indicated that the services were relatively ineffective.

Assessment of the Title I Program by Laboratory Teachers

The Laboratory Teacher's Information Form (LTIF) was designed to collect data on all aspects of lab teachers' involvement with the Title I program. Information was collected on the lab and tutorial programs, instructional support services, staff development activities, and lab teacher perceptions concerning the general effectiveness of the 1978-79 school year. The questionnaires were distributed to 173 reading, mathematics, and combination lab teachers, and a total of 110 questionnaires (an overall response rate of 64 percent) were completed. The response rates among the three groups varied substantially. Reading laboratory teachers had the highest response rate (89 percent); the mathematics laboratory teachers' response rate was 65 percent; and the combination laboratory teachers had the lowest response rate (37 percent).

Laboratory Program

The Title I laboratory program, which is the main component of Title I supplementary instructional services, was designed to provide supplementary basic skills instruction to Title I students. Information was collected from lab teachers to examine how several aspects of the lab program affected its operation. These aspects included:

- scheduling of students;
- lab class size; and
- physical components of the lab setting.

As the data reported in Table 6 indicate, over one-third of the lab teachers encountered difficulties in scheduling students for lab during the 1978-79 school year. Math lab teachers were the least satisfied with the existing scheduling procedures, with half of the respondents reporting problems in scheduling. On the other hand, a considerable majority of the reading (67.2 percent)

and combination (70 percent) teachers reported that they had not experienced difficulty with scheduling students for lab sessions. Many of the lab teachers suggested the following changes to improve the scheduling system: (1) reduce the number of students while allowing additional time for each session, and (2) devise a more flexible student schedule in order to alternate which regu' classes Title I students miss as a result of their participation in the lab.

Table 6

Lab Teachers' Evaluation of Scheduling (in Percent) (1978-79)

Group	Was scheduling students for lab a problem?		
	Yes	No	No response
Reading lab teachers	32.8	67.2	----
Mathematics lab teachers	50.0	45.2	4.8
Combination reading/math teachers	30.0	70.0	----
TOTAL	39.1	59.1	1.8

When asked to comment on the impact of class size on their instructional program, most lab teachers indicated that class size substantially affected the program. A considerable majority of the respondents reported that a small class size, for example fewer than 10 students, was more effective because it permitted the Title I students to receive the individual attention they needed. Lab teachers pointed out that individual attention was a necessity because of the students' varied interests and abilities. In order for larger lab sessions to be effective teachers required additional aide services.

As shown in Table 7, the majority of lab teachers were satisfied with the various components of their laboratory. However, approximately one-fourth of the respondents stated that their allocation of instructional equipment, supplies and materials, and storage space was not adequate for their needs. As indicated by their negative response, combination teachers were especially

dissatisfied with their supply of these three components (40 percent, 30 percent, and 40 percent, respectively).

Table 7

Lab Teachers' Rating of Adequacy of Lab Components (in Percent) (1978-79)

Was this component adequate for your needs?	Laboratory Component					
	Location of lab space	Size of Room	Instructional equipment	Furniture	Supplies Materials	Storage Space
Yes						
Reading	87.9	86.2	62.1	77.6	65.5	72.4
Math	83.3	90.5	69.0	76.2	71.4	69.0
Combination	90.0	80.0	50.0	60.0	60.0	30.0
Total	86.4	87.3	63.6	75.5	67.3	67.3
No						
Reading	12.1	13.8	27.6	15.5	25.9	22.4
Math	14.3	9.5	28.6	21.4	19.0	19.0
Combination	10.0	20.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	40.0
Total	12.7	12.7	29.1	17.3	23.6	22.7
Not applicable or No response total	.9	----	7.3	7.3	9.1	10.0

Tutorial Program

In addition to the lab program, a considerable number of lab teachers were involved in the Title I tutorial program. As shown in Table 8, 68 percent of the respondents rated the tutorial program as effective to very effective. Slightly more than one-fourth of the lab teachers (32 percent) indicated that the program had been relatively ineffective. Almost one-half of the lab teachers offered suggestions to increase the effectiveness of the tutorial program. These recommendations included the following:

- Aides should have more inservice training, more time to prepare for class, and improved guidance;
- Student attendance and progress reports should be maintained; and
- Students and parents should be encouraged to participate in the tutorial program.

Table 8

Lab Teachers' Rating of Effectiveness of Tutorial Program (in Percent) (1978-79) (n=85)

Group	Rating: Very effective 1-2	Rating: Effective 3	Rating: Relatively ineffective 4-5
All lab teachers	20.0	48.2	31.8
Reading lab teachers	23.4	40.4	36.2
Math lab teachers	15.6	56.3	28.1
Combination reading/ math teachers	16.7	66.7	16.7

Instructional Support Activities

Mutual support and cooperation among all levels of the school and Title I staff are crucial factors in assuring effective delivery of Title I services. Data were collected from lab teachers to examine the effectiveness of three major interactive support activities relevant to delivery of instructional services to Title I students. The first was interactions between lab teachers and other school staff, especially classroom teachers. Even though lab teachers were not required to assist classroom teachers, 87 percent of the respondents assisted their colleagues in a variety of ways. The following is a list of major types of assistance rendered:

- Coordination of instructional activities and follow-up work, discussion of teaching strategies, and assistance with skills instruction;
- Acquisition of materials for lab and classroom instruction;
- Attendance at conferences with teachers, parents, and students in order to discuss student progress;

- Assistance during testing periods (primarily reading teachers); and
- Provision of additional individual and group tutoring.

Approximately 75 percent of the lab teachers reported that the school staff provided them with a number of services. Respondents cited the following as the most important types of assistance they received: (1) teachers cooperated in planning which skills to teach and reinforced lab skills in the classroom; and (2) teachers were available for conferences on student progress, made classroom records available, and held joint conferences with parents. Classroom teachers also referred students for the lab program, provided needed materials, and were helpful in arranging for lab teachers to attend staff development activities. A considerable number of lab teachers (41 percent) indicated that other types of support would be helpful. The following is a list of their suggestions:

- Additional coordination and communication between teachers regarding basic skills instruction;
- Cooperation in scheduling and sending children to lab promptly; and
- Additional teaching and clerical aides, and full-time program assistants.

The second type of interactive activity critical to program success involved the Title I building staff which included parent partners, program assistants, and classroom aides. An overwhelming majority of the lab teachers (93 percent, n=104) reported that they had benefited from the building staff's support. However, one-third of the lab teachers recommended ways in which to improve the building staff's services. The most frequent suggestion was that there be a full-time program assistant. Other recommendations included:

- Additional workshops on recordkeeping;
- A full-time aide, increased assistance with clerical duties, and pupil personnel services; and
- Access to equipment and supplies, books for students, and a petty cash fund.

The third type of interactive support identified by lab teachers involved the regional Title I staff. Their services were judged helpful by 93 percent of the respondents (n=105). One-third of the lab teachers made suggestions to strengthen the regional staff's services. Lab teachers' recommendations included the following:

- Additional group conferences involving both Title I and school staff in order to encourage mutual support and cooperation;
- Prompt delivery of reading materials at the beginning of the school year and a series of orientation meetings in order to discuss their usage;
- More frequent staff development activities, including visits to other schools; and
- Additional supplies and equipment, including a regular film series.

Staff Development

In addition to instructional support through various staff services, Title I planners attempt to develop their staff's instructional skills by offering a variety of staff development activities. Eighty-five percent of lab teachers indicated that they had participated in one or more of the activities offered by the Title I staff development program. The following is a list of the major activities attended by the lab teachers:

- Workshops on instructional methods and recordkeeping;
- Title I reading and math lab team workshops;
- Orientation meeting to demonstrate Random House reading materials (primarily attended by reading teachers);
- Workshops on competency-based curriculum;
- Workshop on writing tutorial prescriptions;
- Title I September orientation meeting; and
- Regional teachers' conference and workshops.

Lab teachers also took part in several other workshops whose topics included the fourth grade extension program, student testing, identifying learning skills, and parental involvement.

Overall Program Effectiveness

In judging the overall effectiveness of the 1978-79 Title I program, 95 percent of the lab teachers (n=103) believed that their year with Title I students had been effective. However, a considerable majority of the respondents offered recommendations in order to increase the program's effectiveness in the future. The most frequently mentioned suggestion was that the number of children in each class be reduced. Other recommendations included:

- Additional cooperation and communication between Title I lab and classroom teachers;
- Prompt delivery of classroom materials in September and provision of additional audio-visual equipment and storage space;
- Additional full-time aides with adequate inservice training;
- Increased time allowed for planning and group conferences; and
- Additional time for clerical work.

In conclusion, lab teachers stressed that cooperation and communication between Title I and school staff were essential in order to provide effective instruction to Title I students. While most lab teachers felt that their year had been highly successful, many pointed out that some aspects of the Title I program, such as the scheduling procedures and the tutorial program, needed improvement.

Assessment of the Title I Program by Title I Classroom Teachers

The Classroom Teacher's Information Form (CTIF) was designed to collect information on all aspects of the Title I classroom teachers' role in operating the Title I classroom program, their interaction with and opinions of other segments of the instructional program, the success of the staff development program, and the effectiveness of the 1978-79 school year. The CTIF was distributed to all Title I classroom teachers in grades kindergarten-three. Of the 649 forms distributed, 395 (61 percent) were returned. The data included in this section of the report are presented in aggregate form except where significant variations exist across grades.

Composition of the Title I Classroom

Tables 9-13 present data describing the Title I classrooms, including the range in class size, percentage of Title I students, and type of classroom. The majority of the classroom teachers (91 percent; n=394) had 21-30 students in their class. Over one half of the teachers (n=320) indicated that their classes were composed of at least 50 percent Title I children, and one-third of the teachers reported that 75 percent or more were Title I students. Only five percent indicated that less than one-quarter of the class were Title I students. Seventy-seven percent of the teachers taught in a self-contained classroom; 17 percent taught in an open space, and even fewer respondents, five percent, taught in a combination of a self-contained and an open space classroom.

Table 9

Description of Kindergarten Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent)[a] (1978-79)

Total number in class	Percentage of Title I Students in Class					
	< 25	25-49	50-74	75-99	100	Total %
16-20	--	--	1.7	5.0	3.3	10.0
21-25	--	10.0	8.3	16.7	23.3	58.3
26-30	1.7	1.7	8.3	10.0	6.7	28.4
31-35	--	1.7	--	1.7	--	3.4
Total	1.7	13.4	18.3	33.4	33.3	100.0

[a]Percentages are based on responses from 60 kindergarten teachers.

Table 10

Description of First Grade Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent)[a] (1978-79)

Total number in class	Percentage of Title I Students in Class					
	< 25	25-49	50-74	75-99	100	Total %
16-20	2.4	2.4	2.4	1.2	1.2	9.6
21-25	1.2	18.1	19.3	12.0	1.2	51.8
26-30	2.4	14.5	14.5	4.8	1.2	37.4
31-35	--	1.2	--	--	--	1.2
Total	6.0	36.2	36.2	18.0	3.6	100.0

[a]Percentages are based on responses from 83 first grade teachers.

Table 11

Description of Second Grade Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent)[a] (1978-79)

	Percentage of Title I Students in Class					
Total number in class	< 25	25-49	50-74	75-99	100	Total %[b]
16-20	--	1.3	1.3	--	--	2.6
21-25	7.5	15.0	12.5	10.0	2.5	47.5
26-30	5.0	16.3	20.0	6.3	1.3	48.9
31-35	--	1.3	--	--	--	1.3
Total	12.5	33.9	33.8	16.3	3.8	100.3

[a]Percentages based on responses from 80 second grade teachers.

[b]Due to rounding, percentages may not equal 100 percent.

Table 12

Description of Third Grade Teachers' Classrooms by Class Size and Percentage of Title I Students (in Percent)[a] (1978-79)

	Percentage of Title I Students in Class					
Total number in class	< 25	25-49	50-74	75-99	100	Total %[b]
16-20	--	--	1.4	4.1	1.4	6.9
21-25	--	5.4	18.9	21.6	4.1	50.0
26-30	1.4	12.2	6.8	16.2	--	36.6
31-35	--	4.1	1.4	--	1.4	6.9
Total	1.4	21.7	28.5	41.9	6.9	100.4

[a]Percentages based on responses from 74 third grade teachers.

[b]Due to rounding, percentages may not equal 100 percent.

Table 13

Type of Classroom Utilized by Title I Classroom Teachers (in Percent) (1978-79)
n=390

Group	Type of Classroom		
	Self-contained	Open space	Combination
All teachers	77.4	17.4	5.1
Kindergarten (n=72)	83.3	13.9	2.8
Grade 1 (n=100)	76.0	20.0	4.0
Grade 2 (n=96)	76.0	17.7	6.3
Grade 3 (n=90)	76.7	16.7	6.7
Combination classes			
K-1 (n=3)	100.0	--	--
1-2 (n=12)	75.0	16.7	8.3
2-3 (n=7)	71.4	28.6	--
Others (n=10)	70.0	20.0	10.0

Title I Classroom Program

The Title I classroom program consisted of one and one-half hours of supplementary reading and mathematics instruction each week. This instruction was designed to assist all Title I students with selected subsets of students receiving Title I lab and tutorial services. Most teachers (87 percent) indicated that they had been successful at implementing the Title I classroom program. However, one-third of the teachers indicated that they wished to have additional time to implement the classroom program. Though teachers developed various ways of utilizing the time allotted for Title I instructional activities, almost one-quarter (n=166) of the teachers incorporated Title I activities into their normal instructional routine. Other methods of providing Title I instruction included the following:

- Use of games and supplemental Title I materials in order to review and reinforce basic skills;
- Use of supplemental Title I staff, materials, and scheduled activities from the Title I Curriculum Handbook;
- Provision of enrichment exercises three to four times a week;
- Emphasis on small-group or individual instruction; and
- Inclusion of special Title I activities in the language arts timeslot, especially those related to the reading program.

Thirteen percent of the respondents had been unable to implement the program and cited various problems that they had encountered during the school year including:

- Lack of knowledge and experience to implement the program;
- Inadequate supply of Title I materials;
- Shortage of staff and lab services; and
- Priority given to implementing the Competency-Based Curriculum.

The Title I Curriculum Handbook, which is an integral part of the Title I classroom program, was designed to suggest supplementary instructional activities for grades kindergarten-three. A large majority of the teachers (87 percent) indicated that they had used the Title I Curriculum Handbook as part of their instructional routine. Thirteen percent of the teachers reported that for varying reasons they had not used the handbook. Of those 49 teachers not using the handbook, less than one-half stated that they had not received handbooks. Other reasons included:

- Teachers lacked the time and the Title I services to use the handbook; and
- Teachers utilized other curriculum guides, such as the Competency-Based Curriculum Guide and the Lippincott Reading Series.

As suggested by the high number of teachers who used the Title I curriculum handbook, most of the respondents (91 percent; n=356) found that the handbook was useful; 38 percent reported that it was very useful. As might be expected from this high level of satisfaction with the handbook, only six percent of the teachers had suggestions. The two main recommendations were (1) to expand and diversify the activities paying special attention to including activities for preschoolers; and (2) to assure that every teacher receives a handbook.

Judging the overall Title I classroom program, slightly less than half of the respondents (42 percent) wished to see changes made in the program. The most frequently suggested change was that each classroom have a full-time aide, especially the kindergarten classes. Other recommendations included:

- Additional flexibility in selecting Title I students with increased importance given to teacher's recommendations;
- Improved scheduling to assure that children do not miss "prime time" instruction;
- An adequate supply of equipment and materials;
- Increased cooperation between classroom and Title I teachers; and
- Additional parental involvement, with full-time parent partners for all students who do not receive lab services.

Interactions Among Providers of Title I Services

According to survey respondents, much of the success of the Title I program depends on the cooperation between classroom teachers and Title I personnel. An important component of this cooperation is the interaction between classroom teachers and Title I lab teachers. The classroom teachers (excluding the kindergarten teachers whose children do not attend lab) reported a fairly high level of interaction with Title I lab teachers. The most frequent type of interaction was informal conferences, with 89 percent (n=285) of the classroom teachers reporting

such interactions. Substantially fewer respondents participated in other cooperative efforts with lab teachers, including formal conferences (22 percent), use of checklists (32 percent), or planning sessions (27 percent).

Effectiveness of Title I Services

As data presented in Table 14 indicate, a substantial number of classroom teachers indicated that in 1978-79 the Title I laboratory program (82.7 percent) and kindergarten aide services (70.7 percent) had been effective. Approximately half of the teachers reported that the pupil personnel services (51.9 percent) and parent partner services (49.8 percent) were effective. Thus these services were not considered by classroom teachers to be as consistently effective as the lab program and kindergarten aides. In fact, one-fifth of the respondents rated parent partner services as relatively ineffective.

Table 14

Classroom Teachers' Rating of Four Title I Instructional and Support Services (in Percent) (1978-79)

Service	Rating			
	Very effective 1-2	Effective 3	Relatively ineffective 4-5	Not implemented or No response
Laboratory program (Grades 1-3 only)	45.2	37.5	6.8	10.5
Kindergarten aide services (Kindergarten only)	56.0	14.7	4.0	25.3
Parent partners services (Grades 1-3 only)	23.2	26.6	20.1	30.0
Pupil personnel services	26.6	25.3	13.2	34.7

Staff Development Activities

The 1978-79 Title I program provided staff development activities for all classroom teachers who delivered instructional services to Title I students. Thirty-seven percent of respondents indicated that they had participated in such activities; 77 percent of teachers receiving staff development reported that these activities had assisted them in operating the Title I program. Among the benefits derived from staff development were:

- Ideas for classroom activities, games, and use of new materials;
- Explanation of the Title I Curriculum Handbook; and
- Identification of new methods for teaching language arts and mathematics skills.

Overall Program Effectiveness

Ninety-three percent (n=356) of the responding classroom teachers reported that they had spent an effective year with Title I students. At the same time, almost half of the teachers suggested means by which to improve their effectiveness in next year's program. Two of the most frequent suggestions were (1) to increase the number and quality of the educational aides, and (2) to provide additional time for cooperative planning between classroom and lab teachers. Other recommendations included:

- Reduction in the number of students in each class;[11]
- Additional individualized attention, especially for lowest achieving students;
- Improved lab scheduling in order to insure that students do not miss "prime time" instruction; and
- Provision of all Title I services, supplies, and texts.

[11] Pupil/teacher ratios are established system-wide by the D. C. Public School District, and thus the Title I program office is unable to regulate class size.

Summary

In conclusion, data collected from Title I classroom teachers suggest that the 1978-79 school year was very effective, especially in terms of Title I supplementary instructional services. Furthermore, respondents emphasized the overwhelming success of the kindergarten aide program. Additionally, the enthusiasm expressed by classroom teachers who attended Title I staff development activities suggests that a greater effort should be made to encourage the participation of more classroom teachers in such activities. Finally, teachers did indicate that the Title I program could be enhanced by improving the student-adult ratio (through increasing the number of aides) and by encouraging greater coordination between the laboratory and classroom programs, by providing more individualized attention, and through distributing more Title I supplies and texts (particularly the Curriculum Handbook).

Assessment of the Title I Program by Title I Building Support Staff

The Title I Building Support Staff Information Form was designed to collect data regarding the role of the support staff in operating the Title I program at each school. The questionnaire gathered data regarding each building support staff person's duties, the tutorial program, the instructional support services, and the perceived effectiveness of the 1978-79 Title I services. Persons surveyed included the following: program assistants, laboratory aides, kindergarten aides, and parent partners. Of the 780 forms distributed, 232 completed questionnaires were returned (for an overall response rate of 30 percent). The response rate for each staff category was: program assistants, 60 percent (n=33); educational aides (including lab and kindergarten aides), 35 percent (n=119); and parent partner volunteers, 18 percent (n=67).[12]

Program Assistants

Program assistants performed a wide variety of tasks, with their primary responsibilities including clerical duties and the management and allocation of materials. These tasks included:

- Clerical work including classroom and Title I administrative work;
- Coordination and participation in cultural enrichment activities;
- Acquisition, maintenance, and distribution of supplies and equipment;
- Coordination of and participation in in-school activities (e.g., performances, workshops);
- Coordination of parent partners;
- Arrangements for clothing, referrals to community agencies, and transportation; and
- Home visits.

[12]Thirteen forms received from miscellaneous sources (e.g., resource teachers and pupil personnel aides and workers) are not reported in this analysis.

A substantial majority of program assistants (70 percent) indicated a need for changes in their current duties and responsibilities. The most frequent suggestions were that (1) the number of program assistants be increased, and (2) the responsibilities of the program assistants should be more clearly delineated. Other recommendations included:

- The position and the salary of the program assistant should be upgraded;
- The amount of clerical work, especially lab work, should be decreased and a staggered timetable should be designed for Title I reports and testing; and
- Title I should deliver supplies, and send checks and information by mail.

Educational Aides

The laboratory aide's responsibilities included assisting in both the lab and tutorial programs. Their duties included the following:

- Assistance with basic skills instruction and in planning lessons;
- Provision of individual and group tutoring in the tutorial program;
- Performance of a wide variety of clerical duties for Title I staff, including completing lab forms and taking attendance;
- Performance of various clerical duties for classroom teachers such as correcting classroom exercises and taking attendance;
- Assistance in special in-class activities such as reading stories, playing games and designing bulletin boards; and
- Participation in cultural enrichment activities.

Slightly less than half of the lab aides (49 percent) suggested changing the responsibilities of their position. The most frequent suggestion was that there be greater recognition for lab aides, including an upgraded salary and position. Other recommendations included:

- Clearer definition of duties, with elimination of classroom, playground, or cafeteria duties; and
- A decrease in the amount of Title I forms required and an increase in time allotted for clerical work.

Kindergarten aides were allocated on the basis of the optional service packages provided to each school in 1978-79. Kindergarten aide services were included in three of the four options packages, and thus served approximately 75 percent of the Title I schools. The duties of the kindergarten aides closely paralleled those of the lab aides. Like the lab aide, the kindergarten aide served both in the classroom and in the tutorial program. (Since kindergarten children did not participate in the tutorial program, kindergarten aides provided tutorial services to children in grades one through three.) The following is a list of the major services they provided:

- Assisting kindergarten teachers with instruction in basic skills, planning lessons, working individually with children, and helping with special in-class activities;
- Teaching in the tutorial program;
- Performing clerical duties; and
- Supervising the playground and in the cafeteria, halls, and gym.

Approximately one-third of the kindergarten aides indicated a need for changes in their job. Their recommendations included the following:

- An increase in the status and salary of the aides;
- A greater allotment of instructional time with slow learners;
- Assignment of an aide to one teacher all year; and
- More timely scheduling of aides' work by teachers.

Parent Partners

As members of the support staff, each parent partner worked two days a week, assisting primarily in the classroom. Parent partners' duties included the following:

- Provision of assistance to teachers in reading and math instruction, individual instruction, and special in-class activities;
- Supervision on the playground and in the cafeteria, halls, and gym;
- Participation in cultural enrichment activities; and
- Performance of various clerical duties for classroom teachers.

Approximately one-third of the parent partners recommended that changes be made in their position. Recommended changes included the following:

- The opportunity to advance and become an educational aide;
- An upgrading of the position's status and provision of a salary;
- Additional time with the children, especially the slow learners;
- Assignment to only one teacher, with work scheduled ahead of time; and
- Provision of additional staff development activities.

Effectiveness of the Tutorial Program

A large share of the responsibility for delivering tutorial program services to Title I students rested with the building support staff, and especially with the aides who provided most of the instructional services. As indicated in Table 15, a large majority of the building staff as a whole (76.7 percent) reported that the tutorial program had been effective, and over one-third felt that the program was very effective in the 1978-79 school year. However, perceptions of the effectivenes of the program varied among the four separate categories of the support staff. Over one-half of the parent partners believed that the program had been very effective, while approximately one-fourth of the program assistants and kindergarten aides indicated that the program had been relatively ineffective. It must be noted, however, that over one-third of the respondents in each of these two categories felt that the programs were very effective. Thus even within each staff categories a wide range of perceptions about program effectiveness was reported. Over one-third of the respondents suggested methods by which to improve the level of services. Their recommendations included the following:

- Increased emphasis on having students attend the tutorial program regularly;
- Earlier starting date and flexible scheduling;
- Additional time for team planning between teachers and aides;
- Encouragement for more parents to become involved in the program;

- Additional supplies and equipment; and
- Expansion of the Title I staff, especially more aides and parent partners.

Table 15

Building Support Staff's Rating of Effectiveness of Tutorial Program (in Percent) (1978-79)

Group	Rating: Very effective 1-2	Effective 3	Relatively ineffective 4-5	Not implemented	No response
Building support staff (n=219)	37.0	39.7	16.0	1.4	5.9
Program assistants (n=33)	36.4	27.3	27.2	3.0	6.1
Lab aides (n=76)	27.6	48.7	19.7	---	4.0
Kindergarten aides (n=43)	30.2	41.9	23.2	2.3	2.3
Parent partners (n=67)	52.3	34.3	1.5	1.5	10.5

Staff Interactions

In order to deliver Title I services effectively, the building support staff relies on the cooperation of the other members of the building and regional Title I staff. As indicated in Table 16 an overwhelming majority of the respondents (90 percent) reported that the building staff's services had been helpful, and approximately half reported that the building staff had been very helpful during the school year. As also shown in Table 16, each individual component was extremely pleased with the cooperative services they had received from the other members of the building support staff. Furthermore, as indicated in Table 17, 83 percent of the respondents indicated that the services provided

Table 16

Building Support Staff's Rating of Helpfulness of Building Title I Staff (in Percent) (1978-79)

Group	Rating: Very helpful 1-2	Helpful 3	Relatively unhelpful 4-5	No response
Building support staff (n=219)	55.8	33.8	5.9	4.6
Program assistants (n=33)	72.7	18.2	9.1	---
Lab aides (n=76)	38.2	44.7	10.6	6.6
Kindergarten aides (n=43)	48.9	39.5	4.6	7.0
Parent partners (n=67)	71.7	25.4	---	3.0

by the regional Title I staff also had been helpful to very helpful. Interestingly, although a greater percentage of program assistants than any other support staff category rated the regional staff as being very helpful, program assistants were also the most critical. Lab aides were also critical (14 percent rated the regional staff as relatively unhelpful), although three-quarters of them found the regional staff to be helpful, and one-quarter found the regional staff to be very helpful.

Table 17

Building Support Staff's Rating of Helpfulness of Regional Title I Staff (in Percent) (1978-79)

Group	Rating: Very helpful 1-2	Helpful 3	Relatively unhelpful 4-5	No response
Building support staff (n=219)	47.1	36.1	9.6	7.3
Program assistants (n=33)	63.7	18.2	15.1	3.0
Lab aides (n=75)	35.5	40.8	14.5	9.2
Kindergarten aides (n=43)	48.9	37.2	7.0	7.0
Parent partners (n=67)	50.8	38.8	3.0	7.5

Staff Development

In addition to their other support services, the Title I program provides a staff development program aimed at enhancing the instructional skills of the building support staff. Overall, 73 percent of the respondents indicated that they had participated in Title I staff development activities during the 1978-79 school year. Of the group, 88 percent reported that they had benefited from such activities. Among the four staff categories, the lab aides had the highest participation rate (82 percent); of that group, 79 percent indicated that the activities had assisted in implementing the school's Title I program. Parent partners had the lowest participation rate (61 percent), but 98 percent of participants in staff development stated that the activities had increased their effectiveness in the program. Approximately one-fourth of the building support staff explained how staff development activities had helped them implement the Title I program. These activities included:

- Development of their teaching ability;
- Workshop demonstrations in filling out Title I forms, writing learning prescriptions and using new materials such as the Random House reading series;
- Provision of new instructional ideas;
- Greater familiarization with Title I objectives, the program staff, and others involved in the program;
- Clarification of the duties of Title I personnel; and
- Assistance in implementing the tutorial program and demonstrated use of materials.

Effectiveness of the School Year

As presented in Table 18, 90 percent of the building support staff believed that the 1978-79 school year had been effective. Seventy percent of the program assistants indicated that their year had been effective, while over 90 percent of the respondents in the other three support staff categories regarded the year as effective. Slightly less than half of the respondents discussed methods by which to improve their services in the 1979-80 school year. These suggestions included:

- Encouragement of increased communication and cooperation between teachers and Title I staff;
- Additional, and more effective, staff development activities;
- More parental involvement and an increase in workdays for parent partners;
- An adequate supply of materials and equipment delivered promptly at the beginning of the school year;
- Improvement of the program's organization, and a clear delineation of the program objectives and job responsibilities; and
- Additional time to work with individual children.

Table 18

Building Support Staff's Rating of Effectiveness of School Year (in Percent) (1978-79)

Group	Was it an effective year with the students? Yes	No	No response
Building support staff (n=219)	89.5	4.1	6.4
Program assistants (n=33)	69.7	15.2	15.2
Lab aides (n=76)	92.1	2.6	5.3
Kindergarten aides (n=43)	93.0	4.7	2.3
Parent partners (n=67)	94.0	---	6.0

Summary

In conclusion, the majority of the building support staff indicated that the Title I instructional programs and instructional support services, especially the staff development program, had been effective. However, a number of the respondents suggested ways in which to improve their respective positions, such as upgrading their job status and salary. Furthermore, as indicated by the parent partners' very low response rate, their below average participation in staff development activities, and various staff recommendations, additional Title I parents need to be encouraged to participate more fully in the Title I program.

Assessment of the Title I Program by Title I Pupil Personnel Workers

The Pupil Personnel Team Member's Information Form was designed to gather data in order to assess the effectiveness of this major Title I support service. Each team member (pupil personnel worker, pupil personnel aide, clinical psychologist, and psychiatric social worker) described how students were referred for Pupil Personnel Services and the types of services offered to Title I students and families. In addition, members rated the success of their year and recommended improvements to make both their individual role and the Pupil Personnel Team as a whole more effective. A total of 54 questionnaires were distributed, with completed forms being returned by: 86 percent of the pupil personnel workers and aides (n=18 for each category), 50 percent of the clinical psychologists (n=3), and 100 percent of the psychiatric social workers (n=6).

Program Operations

As of FY 1978, Pupil Personnel Services and three other optional Title I services were allocated on the basis of "option packages." There were four separate packages, each containing three optional services. The Pupil Personnel Team was an optional service in three of the four packages, and thus approximately 75 percent of the schools received Pupil Personnel Services.

At the designated schools, all Pupil Personnel Team (PPT) members reported receiving student referrals through similar channels. Students were recommended to receive support services on the basis of both written and oral referrals. Referrals were made by the following groups:

- Teachers,
- Principals,
- Parents,
- Counselors,
- Title I staff and team observations,
- Community agencies and neighborhood residents, and
- Students.

Pupil Personnel Worker

The majority of the pupil personnel workers (PPW) have extensive experience in their positions with 78 percent of the PPWs having worked 12-13 years, and the remaining 22 percent indicating that they had worked for 8-10 years. Almost all of the PPWs help at either two or three schools (61 percent and 33 percent, respectively) with only six percent assisting at only one school. Half of the PPWs reported that they served 10-20 students per week, and 39 percent indicated that they worked with 21-50 students.

Even though the PPWs were part of an optional service, they were responsible for the delivery of both base and optional Title I services. Their duties included:

- Liaison with community agencies;
- Arrangements for eyeglasses, clothing, food, housing, and other social services;
- Counseling;
- Assistance with tutoring, proctoring, and special education;
- Accompaniment of students on cultural enrichment activities;
- Home visits and parent/staff conferences; and
- Crisis intervention.

The Title I program is based on the provision of comprehensive support for its students through joint efforts by parents, school personnel, and community

agencies. Therefore, the Title I program support services extend to the parents of Title I students. The PPWs provided the following services to Title I families:

- Arrangements for food, clothing, eyeglasses, shoes, etc.;
- Referrals to community agencies;
- Counseling;
- Recommendations of appropriate physical and mental health services; and
- Assistance to parents in obtaining employment.

In evaluating the effectiveness of the 1978-79 school year, a substantial majority of PPWs (89 percent) rated their year as successful. However, a considerable number of respondents recommended changes in their role and in the PPT. Well over half of the respondents suggested ways in which to improve the quality and effectiveness of the pupil personnel worker. Specific recommendations included the following:

- Reduction in the number of schools served by each PPW;
- Establishment of a team office or some other arrangement for adequate office space, provision of necessary supplies, and access to a telephone;
- Additional staff development activities, especially workshops;
- Increased coordination between staff field personnel and school staff, and among all levels of the Title I program; and
- An extended staff, especially the clinical psychologists and supervisory staff.

Finally, 83 percent of the PPWs recommended methods by which to improve the pupil personnel service as a whole. The most frequently mentioned suggestion was that additional pupil personnel team members be hired. Furthermore, the PPWs wished to see the school personnel acknowledge the services of the PPT and give greater trust to the Title I staff. In summary, the pupil personnel workers carry out a wide variety of services, but in the view of most PPWs, their effectiveness could be enhanced by such measures as reducing the number of

schools served by each worker, increasing the staff size, and supplying adequate office space and supplies.

Pupil Personnel Aide

The profile of the pupil personnel aide (PPA) was remarkably similar to that of the PPW. A high proportion of aides had worked in their position for a long period of time: 89 percent indicated that they had worked for 7-13 years, while only six percent had worked less than one year. Slightly more aides than PPWs served two schools (67 percent), 28 percent worked at three schools, and six percent assisted at one school. Forty-four percent of the aides served 10-20 students per week, 36 percent indicated that they had assisted 21-50 students, and 11 percent reported that they had served 60 students per week.

The pupil personnel aide assisted the PPW in delivering many of the Title I base and optional services. However, the aides' duties were specifically oriented toward interaction with Title I parents and performing clerical tasks. The wide-ranging role of the aide is demonstrated in the following list of the aides' services:

- Referrals to various community agencies;
- Arrangements for eyeglasses, clothing, food and housing, and other social services;
- Home visits and conferences with parents and school staff;
- Assistance with tutoring, proctoring, and special education;
- Counseling;
- Maintenance of attendance records;
- Provision of transportation for students; and
- Liaison between community agencies, parents, and teachers.

The aide provided many of the same services to families of Title I students since most support services are designed as collaborative efforts between home, school, and community resources. The major services which the aides delivered to families included the following:

- Referrals to various community agencies, physical and mental health clinics, and employment agencies;
- Arrangements for food, clothing, eyeglasses, shoes, housing, etc.;
- Home visits and parent conferences to discuss student progress; and
- Counseling and crisis intervention.

An overwhelming majority of the PPAs (94 percent) expressed the belief that their services had been effective in the 1978-79 school year. Nonetheless, a large majority of the aides offered recommendations regarding the improvement and increased effectiveness of their services. Their suggestions included:

- Additional support from the school staff, especially principals, and a clearer delineation of aides' responsibilities;
- An upgrading of aides' salary and position;
- Provision of adequate office space and materials, including a telephone;
- Improved coordination of Title I personnel at all levels and better monitoring procedures;
- More effective inservice training;
- A decrease in the amount of clerical work performed by aides; and
- Reduction in the number of schools served by each aide.

In addition, 83 percent of the aides had suggestions to improve the Pupil Personnel Team, including the following:

- Improved coordination and communication among all levels of the Title I staff;
- One central office for the Pupil Personnel Team, with access to a telephone;
- Additional staff development activities, especially workshops; and
- An extended and upgraded staff.

In conclusion, PPAs are responsible for a wide variety of support services for both Title I students and families. However, like the PPWs, the aides believed that they would work more effectively with greater support and cooperation from the school staff. In addition, they recommended various measures to upgrade and clarify the position of the pupil personnel aide as a valuable component of the Title I program.

Clinical Psychologist

Clinical psychologists (CP) were responsible for evaluating the emotional and learning problems of Title I students in order to assist school staff in removing learning barriers. The majority of the clinical psychologists have worked 8-13 years, and they carried out their duties in seven or eight schools per year. The number of students served per week varied: one of the respondents served three to four students, one served eight to 10 students, and one served 15 students.

The main emphasis of the clinical psychologists' work was on diagnostic measures and conferences. Their services to Title I students included the following:

- Individual psychodiagnostic assessment and follow-up;
- Consultations with school and community personnel;
- Parent conferences;
- Direction of workshops on learning techniques;
- Counseling; and
- Referrals to various community agencies.

As suggested by this list of services, it was crucial for the CP to work closely with Title I parents in resolving students' emotional and learning problems. Their work with Title I families involved parent conferences, counseling sessions, and discussions of students' test results.

The respondents unanimously declared that their year with Title I students had been a success. However, all of the clinical staff believed that improvements could be made both in their role and in the Pupil Personnel Team. The psychologists' suggestions for improving their own role included:

- Adequate office space with access to a telephone;
- Provision of an adequate amount of supplies, especially testing materials;
- Additional teacher/parent conferences with psychologists;

- Development of opportunities to consult with other psychologists and to perform research; and
- Reduction in the number of schools served by each psychologists.

Finally, there were two main thrusts of the psychologists' recommendations for the Pupil Personnel Team: (1) to improve the coordination and communication between the Title I staff, especially in regard to the referral system, and (2) to upgrade and increase the Pupil Personnel Team staff.

Thus, the clinical psychologists were concerned most with their working conditions at the schools, but they also stressed the need for a highly qualified and well-coordinated Title I staff.

Psychiatric Social Worker

The fourth category of team staff is the psychiatric social worker (PSW). The primary concern of the PSWs was to help resolve difficulties in the Title I students' home environments in order to remove learning impediments. The majority of the PSWs (67 percent) have worked six to eight years, 17 percent have served 12 years, and 17 percent have worked 17 years. Like the clinical psychologists, most PSWs were responsible for students at seven or eight schools (83 percent), with 17 percent of the PSWs working at five schools. The social workers dealt with more students than the psychologists, serving between 10-30 students per week.

As indicated previously, the PSW strives to assist Title I children by coordinating joint efforts between parents, the school, and the community. Thus, the services which the social worker provided to Title I students and families closely overlapped. These services included:

- Conferences with parents, and school and community personnel;
- Identification and coordination of home, school, and community efforts to assist Title I children;
- Counseling;

- Identification of students for special education;
- Performance of research studies; and
- Interpretation of test results and recommendations.

Psychiatric social workers unanimously reported that their year had been successful, though all respondents believed that changes should be made in order to deliver higher quality services from both the social workers and the team as a whole. Suggestions to improve the level and effectiveness of PSWs' services included the following:

- The full cooperation and respect of the principals and school staff;
- Increased utilization of the social workers' services;
- Adequate office space and supplies, with access to a telephone; and
- Additional staff development activities and increased opportunities for research.

In addition, the following were the social workers' recommendations for the improvement of the Pupil Personnel Team:

- A unified program thrust and better clarification of each member's responsibilities within the program;
- Additional staff development activities;
- Involvement of the PSW in planning the Title I program;
- Identification of Title I students earlier in the school year;
- Hiring of additional staff members, especially clerical help; and
- Reduction in the number of schools served by each PPT member.

In conclusion, 93 percent of the Pupil Personnel Team members (n=45) rated their year with Title I students as effective. However, a substantial number of respondents expressed their dissatisfaction with several aspects of the existing Title I Pupil Personnel Team. Their recommendations stressed the following:

- The team should receive an adequate amount of materials and office space;
- There should be a more effective staff development program; and
- The full cooperation and trust of the school staff are needed in order to work effectively.

In addition, there appears to be needed a clarification of responsibilities for the Pupil Personnel Team and the rest of the Title I staff. Specifically, "option package" personnel, the pupil personnel workers and aides, perform base program services such as arranging for clothing, shoes, eyeglasses, and hearing aids. Principals who indicated that their school was not served by the Pupil Personnel Team (n=5) also reported that the base program services mentioned above were only slightly effective or not implemented. Consequently, Title I children sometimes do not receive base program services when optional service personnel are not available. Possibly in schools which lack pupil personnel services, parent partners could be trained to assist in the coordination and delivery of Title I base program services.

TITLE I PROGRAM'S PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT COMPONENT

As mandated by Public Law 93-380, parent advisory councils were organized not only at the district and intermediate area, but also at each Title I school. The purpose of the legislation was to insure the involvement of parents in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of Title I educational programs, and, in addition, to develop a home-school partnership which would foster Title I students' reading, language, and mathematics achievement. Parents at each local school selected members to serve on the advisory council, with a majority of members having children enrolled in the current, or proposed, Title I program.

Overview of the Title I Parental Involvement Component

The objectives for the Parent Advisory Councils for school year 1978-79 were:

- At the time the proposal is submitted, parent advisory councils will be established at school, intermediate, and district levels, which have as a majority of their members, parents of "children to be served."
- At the time the proposal is submitted, the school, intermediate, and district parent advisory councils will be organized, and officers will be elected.
- At the time the proposal is submitted, school, intermediate, and district parent advisory councils will provide evidence that regularly scheduled meetings have been conducted to make official recommendations regarding the implementation of the Title I Program.

The objectives for the Parent Partners in the 1978-79 school year included:

- By October 31, 1978, approximately 400 parent partners will support the instructional program by giving instructional support services in Title I schools.
- By May 31, 1979, parent partners will have received intensive training through a variety of staff development activities.

These sets of objectives were the guidelines used to establish the two parent programs. A Parent Advisory Council (PAC) was to be established for each participating Title I school, for each of the regions, and for the district. The PACs shared with the LEA the responsibility for planning, implementing, and evaluating the Title I program.

Parent Partners provided instructional and support services in the Title I classroom and tutorial programs. Each parent partner worked approximately two days per week, with the number of parent partners varying in each school according to the number of students identified as needing Title I services.

Parent Advisory Councils (PACs)

With a few exceptions, PACs were organized promptly according to program guidelines and were somewhat to very active throughout the 1978-79 school year. Table 19 presents the data on the PACs' size, organization and meeting dates by region.

Table 19

Organization, Meeting Dates and Size of Title I School PACs, Categorized by Region (1978-79)

Region	Number of schools	Number of PACs organized by October 31, 1978	Number of PACs holding meetings by May 31, 1979	Number of PAC members	Average number of PAC members per school
I	18	16	15	118	6.6
II	9	9	6	48	5.3
III	18	16	16	110	6.1
IV	18	14	16	80	4.4
V	15	14	15	72	4.8
VI	2	2	2	14	7.0
TOTAL	80	71	70	442	5.5

As shown in Table 19, in a few schools PACs did not meet their initial deadline for organizing; nevertheless, these schools were holding regularly scheduled meetings by the end of May. In addition, there were a few schools where the opposite happened: schools initially organized and elected PAC officers and delegates, yet were not conducting regularly scheduled meetings by the end of May. Seventy-one (87.7 percent) of the schools had organized a PAC by October 31, 1978, with 70 schools (87.5 percent) holding regularly scheduled meetings by May 31, 1979. A total of 442 parents were involved in PACs, or an average of six per school.

Table 20 presents the activity level of the PACs in school year 1978-79. In each region over three-quarters of the PACs reported having an active year, with a majority of the schools in each region indicating that their year had been very active.

Table 20

School PAC Activity Levels, Categorized by Region (in Percent) (1978-79)

	Activity Level		
Region	Very active	Somewhat active	Relatively inactive
I	72.2	11.1	16.7
II	62.5	25.0	12.5
III	61.1	33.3	5.6
Iv	50.0	44.4	5.6
V	86.7	6.7	6.7
VI	100.0	----	----

Parent Volunteers

Table 21 presents the data gathered from 81 Title I schools on their parent volunteer programs. There were two types of parent volunteers, unpaid volunteers and parent partners who received funds to pay for child care. Though the number of parent partners did not reach the target goal of 400, with the additional 245 parent volunteers there still was a high level of parental

participation in the Title I programs. As shown in Table 21, parent volunteer services were extended over slightly more of the district than parent partner services, serving slightly more schools, but with fewer parent volunteers at each school and serving fewer days per year.

Table 21

Parent Volunteers' Level of Participation in Schools

Participation levels	Paid volunteers	Unpaid volunteers
Total number of schools served	80	87
Elementary schools	62	65
Junior high schools	12	15
Private schools[a]	6	7
Total number of volunteers	357	245
Elementary schools	295	193
Junior high schools	47	35
Private schools	15	17
Average number of days/ volunteer	75.6	53.7
Average number of volunteers/ school	4.5	3.0

[a]Due to unavailability of data, discussion of private schools' implementation of the Title I program is restricted to the parent partner and parent volunteer programs.

Summary

In conclusion, when judged by the objectives established for program year 1978-79, the parental involvement component was a success in a majority of Title I schools. Over three-quarters of the schools both organized a Parent Advisory Council by October 31, 1978, and held regularly scheduled meetings by the end of May, 1979. Furthermore, most Title I schools received both parent volunteer and parent partner services. Though the number of parent partners did not reach 400 as planned, the level of parental participation in Title I programs was considerably higher than in the previous year.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Though they played diverse roles in the implementation of the Title I program, many members of both the school and the Title I staff offered the same suggestions for improving the Title I program. Across all groups, the most frequent suggestion was that additional communication and cooperation be achieved among all levels of the Title I and school staff. In addition, respondents stressed the importance of the Title I program in providing an adequate supply of instructional materials and effective staff development activities. Other recommendations made by each of the groups surveyed are summarized.

Principals and Teachers

Suggestions made by the principals and classroom teachers dealt primarily with the actual instructional process. First, both principals and teachers cited the need for additional program personnel, especially educational aides. Also, laboratory and classroom teachers recommended a reduction in the size of their classes in order to provide more individualized instruction. Classroom teachers also expressed a need to spend more time in cooperative planning sessions with lab teachers, while lab teachers wanted additional time allotted for clerical work. Finally, classroom teachers expressed concern about the scheduling of students for lab and suggested that the schedule's flexibility be increased in order to insure that Title I students do not miss "prime time" instruction.

Building Support Staff

In addition to the previously mentioned recommendations applying to the Title I program as a whole, Building Support Staff members offered a number of suggestions aimed specifically at improving their activities. One of the most frequently made suggestions was that each member's responsibilities be more clearly delineated. Furthermore, all members recommended an upgrading of their respective positions' status and salary. Finally, they emphasized the importance of a strong parental involvement component and suggested that the number of days the parent partners worked be expanded.

Pupil Personnel Team

Many of the suggestions made by the PPT members stemmed from problems they encountered in serving more than one school, the load ranging from one to eight schools per member. They stressed the need for adequate office space, with access to a telephone, at each school they served. Many of the members wished to see a reduction in the number of schools served by each team member. Finally, as mentioned previously, because of each team's multiple school load, the cooperation and trust of the school staff were mentioned as crucial to assure the effective delivery of Title I services.

Parents

The two parent programs must be evaluated separately in order to assess correctly the effectiveness of the parental involvement component. Though neither of the programs fully achieved the objectives established at the beginning of the program year, the parent volunteer program showed a marked improvement. The total number of parent aides doubled, which included an additional 100 parent partners. The average number of days served per parent partner doubled, while the number of days served by each volunteer quadrupled. However, seven fewer schools than in 1977-78 had established a Parent Advisory

Council (PAC) and were holding regularly scheduled meetings by May 31, 1979. Nevertheless, in each region there was no significant difference in the PACs' reported activity level. Well over three-quarters of the PACs were somewhat active to very active throughout the 1978-79 school year.

APPENDIX

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS AND SUPPORT INSTRUMENTATION

PRINCIPAL'S INFORMATION FORM

School Name _____

1. Do you feel that the Title I program this year has been responsive to the needs of students in your school?

   Yes _____ No _____

   Please explain. _____

   _____

   _____

2. How often do parents of Title I students participate in school activities?

Very frequently		Frequently		Never
1	2	3	4	5

3. How effective were the following Title I support services for the students in your school?

	Highly effective		Effective		Ineffective	Not Implemented
Pupil Personal Services	1	2	3	4	5	
Cultural Enrichment	1	2	3	4	5	
Parent Partners	1	2	3	4	5	
Clothing and Shoes	1	2	3	4	5	
Eyeglasses	1	2	3	4	5	
Hearing Aids	1	2	3	4	5	

4. In your opinion, how effective has your school's Title I program been in achieving the following Title I program objectives?

   Objective: Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and 7 will achieve significant gains in reading.

Rating:	Highly effective		Effective		Ineffective
	1	2	3	4	5

Objective: Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and grade 7 will achieve significant gains in mathematics.

Rating:

Highly effective		Effective		Ineffective
1	2	3	4	5

Objective: Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and grade 7 will demonstrate a positive change in affective behavior.

Rating:

Highly effective		Effective		Ineffective
1	2	3	4	5

Objective: Given eight months of Title I supplementary instruction services, identified Title I students in kindergarten through grade 3 and grade 7 will demonstrate growth in psychomotor development.

Rating:

Highly effective		Effective		Ineffective
1	2	3	4	5

5. In your opinion, how effective are the three major Title I program intervention strategies in your school?

	Highly effective		Effective		Ineffective	Not Implemented
Title I laboratory instruction	1	2	3	4	5	
Title I classroom program	1	2	3	4	5	
Title I tutorial program	1	2	3	4	5	

7. What changes would you recommend to help improve each of these strategies? Please explain.

Laboratory instruction _____

_____

_____

Classroom program _____

_____

_____

Tutorial program _____

_____

_____

TITLE I LAB TEACHER'S INFORMATION FORM

School Name _____

1. Are you the:

   Reading lab teacher _____
   Mathematics lab teacher _____
   Combination reading/mathematics _____

2. How long have you been in your present position?
   _____ yrs.

3. Even though not required, what assistance do you provide classroom teachers? (Please list the kinds of services you provide.)

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. Please list the kinds of support and assistance you receive from the regular school staff.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   What other support would be helpful?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Were the services you received this year from the building Title I staff helpful?

Yes ____ No _____

What other types of services would be useful?

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Were the services you received this year from the regional Title I staff helpful?

Yes _____ No _____

What other types of services would be useful?

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Please indicate whether the following components of your laboratory are adequate for your instructional needs.

	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Location of lab space	_____	_____	_____
Size of room	_____	_____	_____
Instructional equipment	_____	_____	_____
Furniture	_____	_____	_____
Supplies/materials	_____	_____	_____
Storage space	_____	_____	_____
Other (specify)			
_____	_____	_____	_____

8. Is scheduling of students into the lab a problem?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what changes might be made to improve the present method of scheduling students into the lab?

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. How does the lab class size impact upon your instructional program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. If implemented, how effective was the Title I tutorial program in your school?

Very effective		Effective		Ineffective	Not Implemented
1	2	3	4	5	

What changes would you recommend to improve its effectiveness?

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Please list the Title I staff development activities you have participated this year.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Do you feel that you have had an effective year with students?

Yes _____ No _____

What would improve your effectiveness in next year's program?

_____

_____

_____

CLASSROOM TEACHER'S INFORMATION FORM
(Grades K-3)

School Name _____

Classroom Number _____

1. What is your class enrollment? _____

2. How many are Title I students? _____

3. What grades do you currently teach? (Circle as many as apply.)

K 1 2 3

4. Is the classroom you teach in:

a. self-contained _____
b. open space _____
c. combination self-contained and open space _____

5. Have you been able to implement the Title I classroom program this year?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, please explain. _____

_____

_____

_____

6. Do you have adequate time to implement Title I activities?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain how you use this time. _____

_____

_____

_____

7. Did you use the Title I Curriculum Handbook as a component of your classroom program?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, please explain. _____

_____

_____

8. In your opinion, how useful was the Title I Curriculum Handbook? (Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 indicating very useful to not useful.)

Very useful		Useful		Not useful
1	2	3	4	5

9. Please indicate any changes you believe should be made in the Title I Curriculum Handbook.

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. If the following services were used for your students this year, how effective were they, in your opinion?

	Highly Effective		Effective		Ineffective	Not Implemented
Pupil personnel services	1	2	3	4	5	
Laboratory program	1	2	3	4	5	
Parent partners services (grades 1-3 only)	1	2	3	4	5	
Kindergarten aide services (kindergarten only)	1	2	3	4	5	

11. What changes would you like to see in the Title I classroom program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Have you participated in any Title I staff development activities this year?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, did these activities help you in implementing your classroom Title I program?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain. _____

_____

_____

_____

13. Please indicate the ways in which you have worked with Title I lab teachers this year to help your students improve:

Formal conferences _____
Informal conferences _____
Use of checklists _____
Planning sessions _____
Other (specify) _____

_____

_____

14. Do you feel that you have had an effective year with students?

Yes _____ No _____

What would improve your effectiveness in next year's program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

TITLE I BUILDING SUPPORTIVE STAFF'S INFORMATION FORM

School Name _____

1. Are you a:

   Parent partner (volunteer) _____
   Program assistant _____
   Lab aide _____
   Kindergarten aide _____
   Other (specify) _____

2. Please list the kinds of Title I services you have provided this year.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. What changes, if any, would you like to see in the duties and responsibilities of your position?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. How effective was the Title I tutorial program for the participating students in your school

Very Effective		Effective		Ineffective	Not Implemented
1	2	3	4	5	

   What changes would you recommend to improve its effectiveness?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. How helpful have services received from building Title I staff been to you this year?

Very helpful		Helpful		Not helpful
1	2	3	4	5

6. How helpful have services received from Title I regional staff been to you this year?

Very helpful		Helpful		Not helpful
1	2	3	4	5

7. Have you participated in Title I staff development activities this year?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, did these activities help you in implementing your school's Title I program?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain _____

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you feel that you have had an effective year with students?

Yes _____ No _____

What would improve your effectiveness in next year's program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

PUPIL PERSONNEL TEAM MEMBER'S INFORMATION FORM

1. Are you the:

   Pupil personnel worker _____
   Pupil personnel aide _____
   Clinical psychologist _____
   Psychiatric social worker _____

2. How long have you been in your present position (indicate number of years)?
   _____

3. How many schools did you serve this year? _____

4. On the average how many Title I students did you serve a week? _____

5. Please list the specific services that you provide Title I students.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. How are students referred to you for services?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. If you work with families, how many clients do you serve? _____

8. Please list the services that you provided to families this year.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

9. What changes do you think are needed in the Title I Pupil Personnel Services component to improve the level of services available to Title I students?

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

10. What changes do you think are needed in your role as a Pupil Personnel Services team member to improve the level of services available to Title I students?

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

11. Do you feel that you have had an effective year with students?

Yes _____ No _____

What would improve your effectiveness in next year's program?_____

_____

_____

_____

PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS (PAC) - ACTIVITY LOG SHEET

For the following list of Title I program schools and regions, please indicate:

1. Whether the PAC was organized, including the election of officers and delegates, by October 31, 1978?
2. Whether the PAC conducts regularly scheduled meetings, by May 31, 1979?
3. The total size of the PAC membership as of October 31, 1978?
4. Whether the PAC is "very active," "somewhat active," or "relatively inactive"?

District Region School	Organized by 10/31/78 (check (✓) if yes)	Meetings by 5/31/79 (check (✓) if yes)	Number of PAC Members	PAC Activity Level		
				Very active	Somewhat active	Relatively inactive
District						
Region I						
Birney						
Draper						
Friendship						
Garfield						
Green						
Hendley						
Ketcham						
Malcolm X						
Moten						

Region School	Organized by 10/31/78 (check (✓) if yes)	Meetings by 5/31/79 (check (✓) if yes)	Number of PAC Members	PAC Activity Levle		
				Very active	Some-what active	Relatively inactive
Savoy						
Stanton						
Simon						
Turner						
Wash. High.						
Wilkinson						
Douglas						
Hart						
Johnson						
Region II						
Adams						
Bowen						
Cooke, H.D.						
Giddings						
Marie Reed						
Syphax						
Thomson						
Francis						

Region School	Organized by 10/31/78 (check (✓) if yes)	Meetings by 5/31/79 (check (✓) if yes)	Number of PAC Members	PAC Activity Level		
				Very active	Some-what active	Relatively inactive
Jefferson						
Region III						
Aiton						
Fletcher Johnson						
Harris						
Kenilworth						
Kimball						
Nalle						
Plummer						
Richardson						
Shadd						
Thomas						
Weatherless						
Young						
Browne						
Evans						
Miller						
Roper						

Region School	Organized by 10/31/78 (check (✓) if yes)	Meetings by 5/31/79 (check (✓) if yes)	Number of PAC Members	PAC Activity Level		
				Very active	Some-what active	Relatively inactive
Woodson						
Region IV						
Bryan						
J.F. Cook						
Goding						
Langston/ Slater						
Lenox						
Lovejoy						
Ludlow Taylor						
Miner						
Simmons						
Tyler						
Van Ness						
Walker Jones						
Watkins						
Wheatley						
Wilson						

Region School	Organized by 10/31/78 (check (✓) if yes)	Meetings by 5/31/79 (check (✓) if yes)	Number of PAC Members	PAC Activity Level		
				very active	Some-what active	Relatively inactive
Hine						
Stuart						
Terrell						
Region V						
Bruce-Monroe						
Cleveland						
Gage/Eckington						
Garrison						
Harrison						
Lewis						
Meyer						
Montgomery						
Park View						
Raymond						
Seaton						
Tubman						
Banneker						
Garnet-Patterson						

Region School	Organized by 10/31/78 (check (✓) if yes)	Meetings by 5/31/79 (check (✓) if yes)	Number of PAC Members	PAC Activity Level		
				Very active	Somewhat active	Relatively inactive
Shaw						
Region VI						
Emery						
Webb						

PARENT VOLUNTEERS - ACTIVITY LOG SHEET

For each of the following Title I Program Schools, please indicate:

1. The total number of volunteers involved in the Title I Program in the school during this school year.

2. The number of Parent-Partner Volunteers in the Title I Program in each school (i.e., those who have received stipends).

3. The approximate average number of days served by each volunteer in the Title I Program in the school.

SCHOOL	Total Number of Volunteers in the School	Total Number of Parent-Partner Volunteers (i.e., those receiving stipends)	Average Number of days served	
			A By Parent-Partner Volunteers	Un-Paid Volunteers
Aiton				
Bryan				
Banneker				
Bowen				
Browne				
Bruce-Monroe				
Birney				
Cleveland				
Adams				
J.F. Cook				
H.D. Cooke				
Douglass				
Draper				

SCHOOL	Total Number of Volunteers in the School	Total Number of Parent-Partner Volunteers (i.e., those receiving stipends)	Average Number of days served	
			A By Parent-Partner Volunteers	By Un-Paid Volunteers
Drew				
Emery				
Evans				
Fletcher-Johnson				
Francis				
Friendship				
Gage-Eckington				
Garnet-Patterson				
Garrison				
Giddings				
Goding				
Green				
Garfield				
Harris				
Harrison				
Hart				
Hendley				

SCHOOL	Total Number of Volunteers in the School	Total Number of Parent-Partner Volunteers (i.e., those receiving stipends)	Average Number of days served	
			By Parent-Partner Volunteers	Un-Paid Volunteers
Hine				
Jefferson				
Johnson				
Kenilworth				
Ketcham				
Kimball				
Lenox				
Lewis				
Miller				
Lovejoy				
Ludlow Taylor				
Malcolm X				
Meyer				
Miner				
Montgomery				
Moten				
Nalle				

SCHOOL	Total Number of Volunteers in the School	Total Number of Parent-Partner Volunteers (i.e., those receiving stipends)	Average Number of days served	
			By Parent-Partner Volunteers	Un-Paid Volunteers
Park View				
Plummer				
Reed				
Raymond				
Richardson				
Roper				
Savoy				
Seaton				
Shadd				
Shaw				
Simon				
Simmons				
Slater/ Langston				
Stanton				
Stuart				
Syphax				
M.C. Terrell				

SCHOOL	Total Number of Volunteers in the School	Total Number of Parent-Partner Volunteers (i.e., those receiving stipends)	Average Number of days served	
			By Parent-Partner Volunteers	Un-Paid Volunteers
Thomas				
Thomson				
Tubman				
Turner				
Tyler				
Van Ness				
Walker-Jones				
Wash. High.				
Wilkinson				
Weatherless				
Webb				
Wheatley				
J.O. Wilson				
Young				
	PRIVATE SCHOOLS			
HOLY COMFORTER				
HOLY NAME				

SCHOOL	Total Number of Volunteers in the School	Total Number of Parent-Partner Volunteers (i.e., those receiving stipends)	Average Number of days served	
			By Parent-Partner Volunteers	Un-Paid Volunteers
HOLY REDEEMER				
STS. PAUL & AUGUSTINE				
OUR LADY PERPETUAL HELP				
ST. MARTINS				
OUR LADY QUEEN OF PEACE				